Amendments to the Claims:

1.   (Currently Amended) A method in a computing system for rewarding the provision of useful item reviews, comprising:

receiving item reviews, each received item review corresponding to an identified item and originating with an identified reviewer;

displaying the received item reviews to customers of a merchant in conjunction with controls usable by the customers to indicate the level of usefulness of each of the reviews;

receiving and storing indications of the activation of the displayed controls;

based upon the stored indications of the activation of the displayed controls, determining a quantitative measure of the level of usefulness of each of the item reviews;

for each reviewer, based upon the quantitative measures determined for each of the reviews of the reviewer, determining a score for ~~each~~ the reviewer; and

displaying information about at least a portion of the reviewers that reflects their scores.

2.   (Original) The method of claim 1 wherein information is displayed about each of a subset of the reviewers having the highest scores.

3.   (Original) The method of claim 1 wherein names of the reviewers are displayed in the order of descending reviewer scores.

4.   (Original) The method of claim 1, further comprising determining for a selected reviewer a rank of the reviewer's score among the scores of all reviewers, and wherein the information displayed about the selected reviewer includes an indication of the determined rank.

5.   (Original) The method of claim 4 wherein the included indication of the determined rank directly indicates the determined rank.

6.   (Original) The method of claim 4 wherein the included indication of the determined rank indicates a range of ranks containing the determined rank.

7.   (Original) The method of claim 4 wherein the information displayed about the selected reviewer is displayed in a web page directed to the selected reviewer.

8.   (Original) The method of claim 4 wherein the information displayed about the selected reviewer is displayed in conjunction with a review of the selected reviewer.

9.   (Original) The method of claim 4 wherein the information displayed about the selected reviewer is displayed in a prominent location within a web site operated by the merchant.

10.   (Currently Amended) A method in a computer system for evaluating an author of item reviews, comprising:

  displaying one or more item reviews submitted by the author to a plurality of consumers;

  soliciting from the consumers to which an item review is displayed an indication of whether the review is helpful;

  receiving and storing any solicited indication provided by the consumers to ~~which~~ whom item reviews are displayed, each indication being either positive or negative; and

  applying a formula to obtain a score for the author based upon stored indications.

11.   (Original) The method of claim 10 wherein the applied formula considers the number of positive indications received for each of the reviews submitted by the author, and the net number of positive and negative indications received for each of the reviews submitted by the author.

12.   (Original) The method of claim 11 wherein the applied formula further considers whether each review submitted by the author is the first review submitted for the identified item.

13.   (Original) The method of claim 10 wherein the applied formula considers, for each review submitted by the author, the number of consumers to whom the review was displayed that subsequently ordered the item identified by the review.

14.   (Original) The method of claim 10 wherein the applied formula is

$$k (2 (A + B + C) - (D + E)),$$

where k is a constant, and A is the number of reviews submitted by the author for which at least 3 positive indications were received, and B is the number of reviews submitted by the author for which at least 10 positive indications were received, and C is the number of reviews submitted by the author that were the first reviews submitted for the corresponding item and for which at least 3 positive indications were received, and D is the number of reviews submitted by the author for which at least 3 more negative indications than positive indications were received, and E is the number of reviews submitted by the author for which at least 10 more negative indications than positive indications were received.

15.   (Original) The method of claim 10 wherein the method is performed reiteratively to maintain an updated score for the author.

16.   (Original) The method of claim 15 wherein one or more additional item reviews submitted by the author are displayed in subsequent iterations that are not displayed in the first iteration.

17.   (Original) The method of claim 15 wherein the method is performed for multiple authors to obtain a score for each of the multiple authors.

18.   (Original) The method of claim 10 wherein the formula ignores indications received from a given consumer for any review received subsequently to the first indication received from that consumer for the review.

19.   (Original) The method of claim 10 wherein the formula ignores indications received from a given consumer for reviews of the author received subsequently to a maximum number of indications received from that consumer for reviews of the author.

20.   (Original) The method of claim 19 wherein the maximum number is 5.

21-34. (Cancelled)

35.   (Currently Amended) A~The method of claim 1~in a computer system for prioritizing received item reviews, further comprising:

          receiving a plurality of item reviews submitted for publication, each item review identifying an author associated with the item review;

          for each received item review,

              if an indication of the aggregate level of usefulness of published reviews of the author the identified reviewer with whom by~the item review originated indicates that the aggregate level of usefulness of published reviews of the author identified by the item review is~has a high score, expediting processing of the received item review; and

if ~~an indication of the aggregate level of usefulness of published reviews of the author~~ the identified <u>reviewer with whom</u> ~~by~~ the item review <u>originated</u> ~~indicates that the aggregate level of usefulness of published reviews of the author identified by the item review is~~ <u>has a</u> low <u>score</u>, omitting to expedite processing of the received item review.

36.   (Original) The method of claim 35 wherein expediting processing of the received item review includes publishing the received item review earlier than it would have been published if processing of the received item review was not expedited.

37.   (Original) The method of claim 35 wherein each submitted item review undergoes editorial review, and wherein expediting processing of the received item review includes causing the received item review to undergo editorial review earlier than it would have if processing of the received item review was not expedited.

38.   (Original) The method of claim 35 wherein the submitted item review undergoes editorial review if its processing is not expedited, and wherein the submitted item review does not undergo editorial review if its processing is expedited.

39.   (New) A computer-readable medium whose contents cause a computing system to perform a method for rewarding the provision of useful item reviews, the method comprising:

receiving item reviews, each received item review corresponding to an identified item and originating with an identified reviewer;

displaying the received item reviews to customers of a merchant in conjunction with controls usable by the customers to indicate the level of usefulness of each of the reviews;

receiving and storing indications of the activation of the displayed controls;

based upon the stored indications of the activation of the displayed controls, determining a quantitative measure of the level of usefulness of each of the item reviews;

for each reviewer, based upon the quantitative measures determined for each of the reviews of the reviewer, determining a score for the reviewer; and

displaying information about at least a portion of the reviewers that reflects their scores.

40.   (New) A computer system for evaluating an author of item reviews, comprising:

a display subsystem that cause one or more item reviews submitted by the author to be displayed to a plurality of consumers;

an input solicitation subsystem that solicits from the consumers to which an item review has displayed an indication of whether the review is helpful;

a storage subsystem that stores any solicited indication provided by the consumers to whom item reviews are displayed, each indication being either positive or negative; and

a scoring subsystem that applies a formula to obtain a score for the author based upon indications stored by the storage subsystem.

41.   (New) The computer system of claim 40 wherein the formula applied by the scoring subsystem considers the number of positive indications received for each of the reviews submitted by the author, and the net number of positive and negative indications received for each of the reviews submitted by the author.

42.   (New) The computer system of claim 41 wherein the formula applied by the scoring subsystem further considers whether each review submitted by the author is the first review submitted for the identified item.

43.   (New) The computer system of claim 40 wherein the formula applied by the scoring subsystem considers, for each review submitted by the author, the number of consumers to whom the review was displayed that subsequently ordered the item identified by the review.

44.   (New) The computer system of claim 40 wherein the formula applied by the scoring subsystem is

$$k (2 (A + B + C) - (D + E)),$$

where k is a constant, and A is the number of reviews submitted by the author for which at least 3 positive indications were received, and B is the number of reviews submitted by the author for which at least 10 positive indications were received, and C is the number of reviews submitted by the author that were the first reviews submitted for the corresponding item and for which at least 3 positive indications were received, and D is the number of reviews submitted by the author for which at least 3 more negative indications than positive indications were received, and E is the number of reviews submitted by the author for which at least 10 more negative indications than positive indications were received.